DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 207 CS 205 633

AUTHOR Fowler, Robert J.
TITLE An Analysis of the Composing Processes of Three Black Adolescents.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 42p.; Research prepared at the University of Pittsburgh.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Dialects; *Black Students; Case Studies; Code Switching (Language); Cognitive Processes; Comparative Analysis; Correlation; Females; *Nonstandard Dialects; Observation; Research; Secondary Education; *Writing (Composition); Writing Instruction; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Composition Process; *Writing Research

ABSTRACT

The study described in this paper was designed to compare the composing processes of three black adolescent females--a low, a moderate, and a high user of nonstandard dialect. After explaining the procedures used in selecting the subjects on the basis of their degree of usage of nonstandard dialect features, the paper describes the research procedures, which included interviews with the subjects about their composing behaviors and observation of their behaviors in writing three modes of discourse--transactional, poetic, and expressive--using both the talk/write process (composing aloud) and the nontalk/write process (composing silently). A summary of the high dialect user's composing processes is presented, and discussions are offered regarding observed differences and similarities in the students' writing behaviors, observed differences in composing processes for the three modes of discourse examined, and differences between the talk/write and nontalk/write processes. Among the results reported are that the low dialect user needed the least amount of time to write the greatest number of words, and made the fewest pauses and the fewest translations from nonstandard to standard English, while the high dialect user used the greatest amount of time to write the fewest words, and made the most pauses and the most translations from nonstandard to standard English. The paper concludes by discussing implications of the study for teaching and research. (GT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188207

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An Analysis of the Composing Processes of Three Black Adolescents

Robert J. Fowler

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert J. Fowler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1979

CS 205 633

An Analysis of the Composing Processes of Three Black Adolescents

Recent interest in the apparent decline in students' writing abilities (Shields, 1976) has caused great concern for all areas of composition, particularly the process of writing (Emig, 1971; Mischel, 1974; Stallard, 1974; Graves, 1975; Brozick, 1976; Perl, 1978). Along with this interest in the composing process, there has also been an increased interest in nonstandard language, particularly Black dialect and the role it plays in academic achievement.

There has been much emphasis placed upon Black dialect and achievement in the language arts. The preponderance of this emphasis, however, has been placed on dialects and reading and dialects and oral language. The area of dialects and writing has been virtually ignored. The few studies which have addressed themselves to this issue have tended to view the interrelationships of dialects and the written products of students. However, it has recently become the contention of many educators, researchers, and other professionals that attention should be focused upon the writing process, rather than the product.

Two studies which emphasized process in their respective areas--Emig's (1971), The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders and Purves' (1968), Elements of Writing About a Literary Work--epitomized the depth of the complexity involved in this virtually unexplored area. In the former study, Emig concentrated on the writing processes of certain high school students.

During approximately the same period of time that there appeared to be initial interest in the dynamics of learning

processes, there also appeared to begin to be considerable interest in nonstandard dialects and in the part they play in the learning process. The Center for Applied Linguistics began to place virtually all of its its emphasis on the area of nonstandard dialects (Williams, 1974).

Studies which deal with the relationships between nonstandard dialects and writing process, at their very best, have been sparse. Although speaking and reading standard English are much needed skills, few can deny the necessity and the advantages of writing, also. Wolfram and Whiteman (1971) point out a few possible reasons why this paucity of research may exist in the area of Black dialect and composition:

> Some researchers and educators may be assuming that by teaching lower-class black students to read standard English, an ability to write standard English will follow naturally (p.3).

Also,

> Another possible reason that some educators have not specifically elaborated on writing difficulties that confront Black English speakers may be due to their reticence in singling out a particular minority group is to underestimate the academic potential of that group. They may reason that writing problems are faced by all students more or less equally (p.4).

Whatever might be the cause of this distinct lack of research in the area of nonstandard dialects and writing, one definite fact is that "evidence seems to suggest that children whose dialects are nonstandard generally produce compositions lower in quality than those produced by middle and upper-middle class children" (Stewig and Lamb, 1972, p. 24).

Along with the problem of teaching composition to speakers of standard dialect, the teacher has the added task of teaching writing to those students who are linguistically different. Research which examines the relationship between written and spoken language seems to indicate that nonstandard dialect speakers show less writing proficiency than standard dialect speakers (Fagen, 1967). To what extent spoken language affects the ability to write, however, is a matter of speculation (Weaver, 1974).

If one can accept the theory that speech is related to writing--particularly for a group whose culture is highly oral--then, it can be reasonably assumed that some degree of Black dialect interference would occur in the compositions of Black dialect speakers. Also, in light of recent revelations as to the logic of Black dialect (Labov, 1975; Langacker, 1973), then, one might also reasonably assume that there is some degree of logic to the compositions of Black dialect speakers (Bailey and Robinson, 1973).

Although Black dialect speakers' oral language shows a close relationship to its written forms, this is not to say that the two are mirror images, however. In reference to the relationship between oral and written language, Vygotsky points out that "written speech is a separate linguistic function, differing from oral speech in both structure and mode of functioning" (p. 98).

That Black dialect speakers do not always write exactly as they talk has been manifested in several studies (Briggs, 1968; Smitherman, 1969; Collins, 1971; Wolfram and Whiteman, 1971; DeStefano, 1972; Sternglass, 1973; Funkhouser, 1976). The bulk of these studies which examine the relationship of Black speech and writing reveal that writing samples of the Black students adhere closer to that of standard dialect than

than their verbal discourse.

It might noted that all of the previously mentioned studies tend to deal with Black dialect as is manifested in the written products of students. Little or no attention has been paid to the issue of the relationship between Black dialect and the composing process. One can reasonably assume that if the product shows signs of interference, then, the process, which gave rise to the product, must have undergone a degree of interference, also. In light of the above information, then, a study which deals with the relationship between Black dialect and the composing process is quite warranted.

In general, studies which have dealt with dialects have been centered around dialects and verbal discourse, dialects and reading, and dialects as manifested in written products. In this study, the investigator attempts to explore the area of Black dialect and the writing process. Specifically, the investigator's purpose is as follows:

1. To provide a descriptive profile of three Black adolescents' composing processes as manifested in transactional, expressive, and poetic compositions and information ascertained from personal interviews and observations.

2. To see if information contained in these descriptive profiles varies according to the individual's classification as a "low," "moderate," or "high" nonstandard dialect user.

Method

Preliminary Steps. The diagnostic compositions were written by a group of high school adolescents enrolled in an alternative high school located in Pittsburgh's Oakland section of the city. The school as approximately a 95% Black population. The group of 45 students was given an in-

class writing assignment with the following directions: "Write a 500-word composition for me* on the topic, 'What an Education Means to Me.' " The investigator was present at the writing of the compositions. The papers were read and examined for the number of predetermined Black dialect features present in order to determine the "degree" of dialect written.

In attempting to classify the students as low, moderate, or high, consideration was made as to the types of nonstandard dialect features present in the diagnostic compositions, as well as to the frequency of occurrence of these features. Thus, if the opportunity of occurrence presented itself and the feature occurred less than 10% of the time, then, the particular feature was not acknowledged as having any consequential degree of composition interference. Anything over 10%, however, as counted as one dialect feature.

In calculating the exact percentage of nonstandard dialect features present in the compositions, the following method as performed:

1) A total count of both the nonstandard dialect feature and the standard form of the same feature was taken.

2) The total frequency of occurrence of the nonstandard dialect feature was divided by the total frequency of both the nonstandard dialect feature and the standard form of the same feature.

3) The percentage of occurrence of the nonstandard dialect feature present was computed.

---

*Here the role of the researcher is that of "pupil to teacher, general" (teacher-learner dialogue) as mentioned by Britton (p. 120).

Thus, the formula utilized for computation of the percentage of occurrence of a particular nonstandard dialect feature present was as follows:

$$\frac{\text{no. of dialect features}}{\text{total freq. of features (dialect and stand. forms)}} = \text{percentage of occurrence of nonstandard feature}$$

Thus, the present students were classified as follows:

Number of Features	Classification
1-2	Low
3-5	Moderate
6-above	High

From the above population, three students were chosen for the study: one high user of nonstandard dialect (Seven features were present in her diagnostic composition), one moderate user of nonstandard dialect (Three features were present in her composition), and one low user of nonstandard dialect (One feature was present in her composition).

Insert Table 1 about here

Subjects. The three students chosen for study--Macy (low), Pam (moderate), and Bari (high)--are 17, 16, and 16 years old, respectively. They are Black females from similar socio-economic backgrounds. All three students reside in predominantly Black sections of the city. The academic records of the three students indicate that they have similar academic abilities.

Procedures. The three students selected to participate in the study were interviewed (to a specific set of questions) individually in reference to aspects of their composing behaviors. After the interview sessions, the students were

assigned six in-class compositions to write. They were requested to use the talk/write (composing aloud) and the non-talk/write (composing silently) processes in each of three modes of discourse--transactional, poetic, and expressive.

During all of the assignments, the students were personally observed by the investigator in order to ascertain information about their writing behaviors. Also, information obtained from these direct observations was used in conjunction with the information gained from the personal interviews and the written products in order to gain a composite picture of the students' composing processes. In reference to the written products, the students were asked to draw a line through all unwanted material, as opposed to erasing, in order to give a clearer picture of their composing processes.

After each of the non-talk/write assignments, the students were interviewed (according to a specific set of "Post-Writing Questions") individually in regards to their composing behaviors. Also, all talk/write and interview sessions were tape-recorded and transcribed.

Method of Analysis. The students' writing processes were examined in two ways--during each stage of the writing process, and according to the use of specific intellectual processes employed in their compositions:

The students were studied in each stage of the writing process as outlined by Britton (1975)--incubation, conceptualization, and revision. In particular, the students' composing processes were studied in reference to certain composing "strategies" involved in writing. "Strategies" here refers to the tactics which the writer employs in order to complete the writing task. All of these strategies may

be viewed as vital aspects of the writing process. These composing strategies may be determined by looking at the writer's behavior during each stage of the writing process. The following questions provided the focus for the observation of the students and partially governed the analysis of the data:

Incubation/Conceptualization

1. How much time did the writer spend "thinking" about the assignment before beginning to write?
2. Did the writer employ any type of pre-writing activity?

Production

1. Did the writer utilized any type of outline, either mental or written?
2. How often did the writer pause during the writing process?

Revision

1. To what extent did the writer revise--words, phrases, paragraphs, etc.?

The rhetorical basis for the second aspect of the analysis incorporated in this study is suggested by Pike (1964); Young, Becker, and Pike (1970); Odell and Cooper (1976); and Odell (1977). According to Pike (1969), an awareness of tagemics ("choice points") can help to improve student writing considerably. In order to improve his/her writing, the student must be aware of and make appropriate choices during a writing experience (p. 53). The students' in the present study writing processes were examined according to their use (quantity and quality) of the intellectual processes of change, contrast, classification, physical context, focus, and sequence. The transactional assignments were designed for the use of the contrast and classification processes. The expressive assignments were designed for the use of

classification. The poetic assignments were designed for the use of physical context, change, and sequence. All assignments allowed for the use of the intellectual process of focus.

Bari: Summary of One Case Study

Incubation/Conceptualization. Bari's (the student classified as the high nonstandard dialect user based upon the results of the diagnostic composition) incubation/conceptualization times spent varied according to the mode of discourse employed and the type of process utilized (talk/write and non-talk/write).

Insert Table 2 about here

As can be seen in the table, for the non-talk/write process, the transactional discourse took the most amount of time and the expressive discourse took the least amount of time. For the talk/write process, the poetic discourse took the most amount of time, and the expressive discourse took the least amount of time. On an average, the expressive discourse required the least amount of time--seven minutes; and the poetic discourse required the most amount of time--twelve minutes. Bari's process of composing aloud required more time in all modes of discourse than the act of composing silently.

The substantive nature of Bari's contemplation prior to writing remained substantially the same for the three modes of discourse and the two types of processes. Most of her concentration appeared to be on how to put her thoughts into words the "right" way. Although she admitted to mentally planning prior to writing, only one assignment

can attest to this.

Production. Bari's writing fluency was determined by the frequency of occurrence of pauses during the talk/write assignments. Her poetic discourse assignment averaged the least number of pauses--54.3. Her transactional discourse assignment averaged the most number of pauses--75.

Insert Table 3 about here

Bari's writing pattern can best be discribed as being, generally, continously progressive and in an "additive" manner with little recursiveness. She usually wrote in a left-to-right fashion, adding phrases, clauses, words,etc., as the process went along. This excerpt taken from a writing assignment reveals a sample of her writing pattern:

1 2 3
When I am happy/ I feel/ real free/
4
like a bird flying in the sky.

Segment number one indicates the first written thought. Two,three, and four indicate additional written thoughts. Her writing pattern remained basically the same for all modes of discourse.

During the writing process, Bari made quite a number of translations* from nonstandard dialect to standard English. For instance, one assignment disclosed the

*"Translation" here refers to the act of vocalizing in Black dialect but converting this dialect into standard dialect before transcribing these thoughts to paper (written form).

following translation:

VOCALIZED: "I can say--I can say I feel like a bird when they be flying."

WROTE: "When I am happy I feel real free like like a bird flying in the sky."

In the above example, she verbalized the use of the habitual "Be"; however, when she wrote this thought, she translated this tense into standard English. There was a total of 16 translations in Bari's three talk/write compositions. The translations did not vary in nature according to discourse--most of them were grammatical in nature.

The complete writing times for Bari varied according to mode of discourse and according to the type of process employed.

Insert Table 4 about here

The talk/write process assignments took a longer period of time to complete than the non-talk/write process assignments in all modes of discourse. For the non-talk/write and the talk/write processes, the poetic discourse took the most amount of time, and the expressive discourse took the least amount of time.

Revision. Bari made quite a number of changes during her writing process, the majority of which were grammatical and simple word changes. This finding held true for both processes and all modes of discourse.

Insert Table 5 about here

Intellectual Processes. The investigator examined all of Bari's compositions for the types and number of intellectual processes employed. In all cases, she was able to utilize the intellectual process for which the assignments were designed. This held true regardless of the type of process employed--talk/write or non-talk/write.

Insert Table 6 about here

Results

The three students under investigation were not only examined as separate individuals, but they were also examined in terms of how they relate to each other. The students showed some marked similarities as well as some significant differences in regards to their writing behaviors durning each stage of the writing process and in reference to the intellectual processes employed in their compositions.

The study revealed that, generally, the low nonstandard dialect user needed the least amount of time to write the most (actual number of words), and the high nonstandard dialect user utilized the most amount of time to write the least. The low and moderate nonstandard

Insert Table 7 about here

dialect users generally thought of mental outlines prior to writing, but the high nonstandard dialect user was

more concerned with putting her thoughts on paper the "right" way. Also, the low nonstandard dialect user made the least number of pauses during the writing process, and the high nonstandard dialect user made the greatest number of these pauses. All three of the students' writing patterns were continuously progressive and additive in nature. The student who was classified as the high nonstandard dialect user made the greatest number of translations from Black dialect to standard English during the writing process, while the low nonstandard dialect user made the least number of these translations. Also, all three of the students placed a great deal of emphasis upon grammatical type revisions.

The three students revealed no significant differences in their use of the intellectual processes of change, physical context, focus, classification, contrast, and sequence; and they were able to utilize all of these processes.

Insert Table 8 about here

Additionally, the study revealed that the expressive discourse assignments required for all three of the students the least amount of time to complete, while the poetic discourse assignments required the most amount of time. The transactional discourse assignments manifested the greatest number of pauses, and the poetic discourse assignments revealed the least number of pauses. The students' substantive nature of pre-writing contemplations, the nature and extent of revisions, and the use of intellectual processes showed no significant differences according to the mode of discourse utilized.

The talk/write and the non-talk/write methods were similar in all areas except in the areas of time and productivity. The talk/write method took longer to produce fewer written words than the non-talk/write method.

Discussion

The purpose of this investigation was to describe the writing processes of three Black adolescents through the use of the case study method. The major procedures involved the deveopment of a profile for each of the three students. These profiles were drawn from information ascertained from interview questions, information obtained from the personal observations by the investigator, and the students' writing samples themselves. The profiles were two-fold: One section was designed to reveal the writing behaviors of the three students in the stages of incubation/conceptualization, production, and revision; and the other section attempted to reveal the students' use of the intellectual processes of change, physical context, classification, contrast, and sequence. The results of this investigation led to a range of conclusions concerning the three major variables of the study--the students themselves, the mode of discourse utilized, and the type of process (talk/write vs. non-talk/write) employed.

The Three Students. One of the major conclusions from this study concerned the writing times for each of the three students. During the incubation/conceptualization period, the student who was diagnosed as the low nonstandard dialect user, generally, took the least amount of time in this stage of the writing process. ON the other hand, the student who was diagnosed as a hifh nonstandard dialect user, generally, took the longest period of time.

Also, for the complete writing time, the low nonstandard dialect user took the least amount of time to complete an assignment, and she wrote more, i.e., the actual number of words per composition. The high nonstandard dialect user took the most amount of time to write the least amount of words per composition. Therefore, there appeared to be a relationship between the student's classification as a low, moderate, or high nonstandard dialect user and the time it took to start and complete an assignment. From this the investigator concluded that the degree to which the students were nonstandard dialect users paralleled the degree of time spent on a writing task and the actual number of words produced during a writing assignment: The low nonstandard dialect user, generally, took the least amount of time to start and complete an assignment and produced the greatest number of words; and the high nonstandard dialect user took the most amount of time to start and complete an assignment and produced the least amount of words.

The low nonstandard dialect user and the moderate user usually thought of mental outlines prior to writing. The high nonstandard dialect user, on the other hand, indicated that she was more concerned with putting her thoughts down on paper the "right" way. For her, the right way was to have everything grammatically correct. This suggests that she was quite preoccupied with having a grammatically correct composition as a sign of excellence. Thus, the investigator concluded that the high nonstandard dialect user was quite engrossed with the idea of eradicating all nonstandard dialect features in her compositions; whereas, the low nonstandard and moderate nonstandard dialect users were more interested in the organization of their compositions prior to writing.

The study of writing fluency, determined by the number of pauses made during a writing assignment, for the three students revealed that the number of pauses made during their writing processes corresponded to their classification as a dialect user; i.e., low, moderate, or high. The high nonstandard dialect user had many more pauses--both silent and writing--than the low dialect user. She (high nonstandard dialect user) was only able to vocalize short phrases, words, etc., before writing them on paper. On the other hand, the low nonstandard dialect user was able to utter longer passages--clauses, sentences, etc., before writing them. These writing pauses accounted for the majority of the pauses made during the students' writing processes and account substantially for the differences in writing times for the three students. Based upon the results of this study, then, writing fluency appears to be influenced by the extent to which an individual is a nonstandard dialect user; i.e., the higher the degree of nonstandard dialect utilized by the individual, the less fluent (more pauses) is his/her writing behavior, and the lower the degree of dialect utilized by the individual, the more fluent (less pauses) is his/her writing behavior.

The writing patterns remained basically the same for the three students. All three of the students followed a continuously progressive, additive pattern, adding words, phrases, clauses, etc., as they went along. The lengths of these words, phrasas, clauses, etc., somewhat varied from student to student. For instance, Macy, the low nonstandard dialect user, was usually able to add much longer written items than the other two students. Therefore, it appears that although the extent to which an individual is a nonstandard dialect user does not influence the writing

pattern itself, the degree to which an individual is nonstandard dialect user does influence the ability to write in "integrated movement sequences" (Smith, 1973), i.e., the number of words an individual is able to write as a complete unit. Also, the degree to which an individual is a nonstandard dialect user appears to influence the quantity of words held in "short-term memory" (Smith, 1971); i.e., the number of words an individual "hears" as he/she writes. The low nonstandard dialect user was generally able to write the greatest number of words at one time. The high nonstandard dialect user generally wrote the least number of words at any one time.

Although the nature of the translations from nonstandard dialect to standard English did not vary among the three students, the extent of these translations varied considerably. The student who was classified as the high nonstandard dialect user made the most amount of translations, and the student who was classified as the low nonstandard dialect user made the least amount of translations. The high nonstandard dialect user made almost three times as many of these translations as the low nonstandard dialect user. Thus, this evidence suggests that there is a relationship between the number of translations made and the student's classification as a low, moderate, or high nonstandard dialect user: The higher the degree of nonstandard dialect utilized by the study, the more need there was to make these translations. Considering the fact that these translations do require time, this evidence can partially account for the differences in writing times for the three students. An example of one

of these translations is cited in the note below.*

The students in this study placed a great deal of emphasis upon grammatical type revisions. Although the low nonstandard dialect user heavily concentrated upon grammatical type revisions, too, she displayed the most versatility; i.e., she made the greatest number of different types of changes. This could suggest that the low nonstandard dialect not only views grammatical changes as being important but a greater number of other types of changes as well.

In general, the students were able to use the intellectual processes of change, physical context, focus, classification, contrast, and sequence. Although there appeared to be no significant differences among the three students in their use of these processes, the low nonstandard dialect user revealed the most versatility in the use of specific intellectual processes. For example, for the intellectual process of change, the moderate and high nonstandard dialect users only related external and internal and/or external change. The low nonstandard dialect user, however, related internal, external, and internal and/or external change. Other examples of this difference between the low nonstandard dialect user and the high and moderate nonstandard dialect users can be seen in the use of the intellectual process of contrast.

The Three Modes of Discourse. The incubation/conceptualization and the complete writing times of the three students varied according to the mode of discourse employed--transactional, poetic, and expressive. Generally, the incubation/

---

* During one of the talk/write sessions, the high nonstandard dialect user vocalized and wrote the following:

Vocalized: "I can say--I can say I feel like a bird when they be flying."

Wrote: "When I am happy I feel real free like a bird flying in the sky."

conceptualization times and the complete writing times directly corresponded in the degree of time spent. This held true in each of the three modes of discourse. During both the incubation/conceptualization time periods and the complete writing time periods, the expressive discourse required the most amount of time. Thus, the mode of discourse utilized did influence the incubation/conceptualization and the complete writing times spent. Expressive assignments, or assignments which required the students to express the inner-self, required less time than transactional or poetic assignments. The latter modes of discourse concentrate on form and the imparting of a specific body of knowledge. Since poetic writing does concentrate on form, this could be the reason why these assignments took the students longer to complete.

The substantive nature of pre-writing contemplation did not appear to vary according to the mode of discourse for the three students. Consequently, the mode of discourse utilized by the three students did not influence the substantive nature of pre-writing contemplation.

Writing fluency varied according to the mode of discourse employed. The transactional discourse assignments revealed the greatest number of pauses, and the poetic discourse assignments revealed the least number of pauses. Therefore, transactional discourse assignments made for the least fluent writing, and poetic discourse assignments made for the most fluent writing. The mode of discourse utilized, then, did influence writing fluency.

The students' writing patterns remained the same during the use of each of the three modes of discourse. During all three modes of discourse, their writing patterns were continously progressive and additive (linear fashion) in nature,

although there there was some degree of recursiveness. The mode of discourse employed, then, had no influence upon writing patterns.

The nature and extent of the types of translations made from nonstandard dialect to standard English were not influenced by the mode of discourse utilized. Generally, the translations remained grammatical in nature during the use of each of the three modes of discourse. Therefore, the mode of discourse employed did not influence the nature and extent of the translations made by the students.

The nature and extent of the types of revisions made did not vary according to the mode of discourse utilized. Generally, the changes were grammatical in nature, regardless of the mode of discourse employed. Thus, mode of discourse did not influence the quantity of quality of the changes made.

The use of intellectual processes did appear to be influenced by the mode of discourse employed. Although the extent of these processes did not vary from discourse to discourse, the types of processes utilized did vary. This varying in the use of different types of processes from discourse to discourse was probably due to the fact that each discourse assignment was designed to allow for the use of specific intellectual processes. Consequently, mode of discourse does appear to influence the types of intellectual processes employed, particularly if the assignment was designed to do so.

The Talk/Write vs. Non-Talk/Write Process. The type of process employed (talk/write or non-talk/write) did influence the incubation/conceptualization and the complete writing times spent. In both areas, the talk/write process took a longer period of time to produce fewer written words

than the non-talk/write process. Thus, the students' act of vocalizing all inner-thoughts was more time-consuming and less productive than the conventional process of composing silently.

The substantive nature of the students' contemplations prior to writing, based upon the talk/write sessions and the post-writing interviews, did not substantially vary according to the type of process employed. The type of process employed by the students, then, did not influence the nature of their pre-writing contemplation.

The students' writing patterns did not vary according to the type of process utilized. Consequently, writing patterns did not appear to be influenced by the type of process employed.

Neither the extent nor the nature of the types of revisions made by the students was influenced by the type of process employed by the students. The talk/write nor the non-talk/write process, then, had an influence on the types of changes made.

No comparisons were able to be made for the talk/write and the non-talk/write assignments in the areas of writing fluency and translations since these two phases of the students' composing processes were examined during the talk/write process, solely. However, since all of the other areas were virtually mirror images--except in the quantity of time spent and the extent of productivity--one can reasonably conjecture that writing fluency and the nature and extent of translations would have been virtually the same, also.

The use of the intellectual processes remained the same during the use of each type of process. The choice of the talk/write or the non-talk/write method, then, did not influence the use of intellectual processes.

Implications for Teaching and Research. The results of this study offer specific implications to those teachers who teach composition to students whose dialects are nonstandard:

1. The greater the degree of nonstandard dialect utilized by an individual, the more time is required for him/her to start and complete a writing assignment. Therefore, the teacher of composition should make allowances for such; i.e., in cases where writing tasks are timed, or the time limits are imposed by class periods, the composition teacher should be aware that the extent to which an individual is a nonstandard dialect user will, generally, determine the amount of time it will take for him/her to start and complete a writing assignment.

2. Since it appears that nonstandard dialect users heavily concentrate upon having a grammatically correct composition, the composition teacher should attempt to get the student to write for meaning first, then work on the minor errors of transcription. In essence, the teacher should make every effort to get the student to get his ideas on paper, first, then work on correcting mechanical elements, grammatical features, etc.

3. The extent to which nonstandard dialect users make translations from their dialects to standard English is rather dependent upon the extent to which the individuals are dialect users; i.e., the greater the degree of nonstandard dialect utilized, the greater the number of translations will be made.

4. Nonstandard dialect users can employ the intellectual processes of change, focus, physical context, sequence, classification, and contrast. Therefore, teachers of composition should design assignments to meet this challenge.

In other words, the composition teacher should design writing tasks to allow the students to utilize these processes.

All of the above implications are based upon the results of an intense study of three students who participated in this investigation, and certain results may or may not be generalized to all students whose dialects are nonstandard.

In the present study, the investigator examined only a facet of a very compley process. The main and ultimate purpose of the research was to describe the writing processes of three Black adolescents. If we wish to view the writing process comprehensively, no areas must remain unexamined. There are several, feasible studies which can follow this investigation:

One important study which could follow this investigation could be an investigation which would describe the writing processes of younger or older Black students. The study could follow the same basic design as the present investigation. Would the profiles of older or younger Black students diagnosed as low, moderate, and high nonstandard dialect users reveal the same or different results as the students in the present study? Information from such studies would aid educators in the understanding of the writing processes of younger and/or older students than the ones who participated in this study.

Another possible study, closely akin to the one above, could be a longitudinal one which would describe the writing processes of nonstandard dialect users at various stages during the student's life; e.g., from elementary school to grade 13 (first year of college). Would the students' writing processes in the areas of incubation/conceptualization, production, and revision, and his/her use of intellectual processes remain basically the same over the years or would

these processes substantially change? This is a needed addition to research, because it would examine the non-standard dialect user's writing process over a period of time. Also, this type study would afford a more comprehensive view of the nonstandard dialect user's writing process, in that it would examine the process over a period of years and not for short durations of time, such as days, weeks, months, etc.

A study which would test the efficacy of the talk/write vs. the non-talk/write process as a pedagogical approach to composition might prove to be quite useful, also. The talk/write and the non-talk/write approaches to writing were utilized in this study; however, they were used in order to gain further insight into the writing process itself; i.e., to ascertain what the students thought during the writing process. However, a study which a study which would compare and contrast these two approaches to teaching composition could prove to be quite lucrative. For instance, can the talk/write process prove to be more useful than the conventional non-talk/write process in diagnosing writing problems as they occur? In other words, if the teacher is able to hear what the student is thinking as he/she writes, then, maybe the teacher would be able to prevent errors before they are put into writing. Also, what kinds of results would the two approaches to composition bare?: Would the student taught by the talk/write or the non-talk/write approach produce the better results? Such a study would be quite useful in that it would actually test the efficacy of the one approach over the other; i.e., the talk/write approach over the non-talk/write approach. Also, the talk/write method can give added insight into the composing process as it actually occurs.

An investigation which would examine other nonstandard dialects in any or all of the above areas could prove to be a worthwhile addition to research in composition. This study could be important in the sense that it would prove insight into the writing processes of other nonstandard dialect users.

Although this study touches some important issues, it is by no means comprehensive. Many other areas of composition need to be investigated before a comprehensive model can be espoused.

References

Bailey, R.W. Dialects and the teaching of composition. In R.W. Bailey and J.L. Robinson (Eds.) Vaieties of present-day English. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1973.

Briggs, D.G. Deviations from standard English in papers of selected Alabama Negro high school students. Unpublisshed doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1968.

Briggs, O.D. A study of deviations from standard Englsih in papers of Negro freshmen at an Alabama college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1968.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLead, A. & Rosen, H. The development of writing abilities (11-18). London: Macmillan Education, 1975.

Brozick, J.R. An investiagation into the composing process of four twelfth grade students: Case studies based on Jung's personality types, freudian psychoanalytic ego psychology and cognitive functioning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1976.

Collins, J.J. Deviations from standard English in written compositions of disadvantaged college freshmen and regular admissions students at Glassboro State College (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32 749-A. (University Microfilms No. 71-19, 977).

DeStefano, J.S. Productive language differences in fifth grade Black students' syntactic forms. Elementary English, 1972, 49, 552-558.

Emig, J. The composing processes of twelfth graders. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971.

Fagan, E.R. (ed). English and the disadvantaged. Scranton: International Textbook Co., 1967.

Funkhouser, J.L. Black English: From speech to writing (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 2156A. (University Microfilms No. 76-22, 538)

Graves, D.H. An examination of the writing processes of seven year old children. Research in the Teaching of English, 1975, 9, 227-241.

Labov,W. The study of nonstandard English. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1975.

Langacker, R.W. Language and its stucture: Some fundamental linguistic concepts. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.

Mischel, T.A. Case study of a twelfth-grade writer. Research in the Teaching of English, 1974, 8, 303-314.

Odell, L. & Cooper, C.R. Describing responses to works of fiction. Research in the Teaching of English, 1976, 10, 203-225

Odell,L. Measuring changes in intellectual processes as one dimension of growth in writing. In C.R. Cooper and L. Odell (Eds.). Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.

Perl, S. The composing processes of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 1979, 13, 317-336.

Pike. K. A linguistic contribution to composition. College Composition and Communication, 1964, 15, 82-88.

Purves,A. Elements of writing about a literary work: A study of response to literature. Champaign: National Council Teachers of English, 1968.

Shields, M. Why Johnny can't write. Newsweek, 1976, 86, 58-62.

Smitherman, G. A comparison of the oral and written styles of a group of inner-city Black students. 1969 (ED 049205)

Stallard, C. An analysis of the writing behaviors of good student writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 1974, 8, 206-218.

Sternglass, M.S. Similarities and differences in nonstandard syntactic features in the composition of Black and White college students in freshmen remedial writing classes. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Pittsburgh, 1973).

Stewig, J.W. & Lamb, P. Elementary pupil's knowledge of the structure of American English and the relationship of such knowledge to the ability to use language effectively in composition. Lafayette: Purdue Research Foundation, 1972.

Smith. F. Psycholinguistics and reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Smith, F. Understanding reading--A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Vygotsky, L.S. Thought and language. (E. Hanfmann and G. Vakar, trans.) Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Weaver, C. Not in our stars, but in our affixes? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, New Orleans, November 1974.

Williams, D. Teaching writing skills to dialectiacally different students. The Journal of Negro Education, 43, 329-331.

Wolfram, W. & Whiteman, M. The role of dialect interference in composition. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971 (ED 045 971).

Young, R.E., Becker, A.L., & Pike, K.L. Rhetoric: Discovery and change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970.

Table 1

Results of Diagnostic Compositions of Three Students

Student's Name	Feature(s) Present in Composition	Frequency of Occurrence of Feature(s)		Total Frequency	Percent	Classification (based upon # of dialect features present)
		Dialect	Standard			
Macy	1. Lack of -S for 3rd person	2	1	3	67%	Low
Pam	1. Lack of -S for 3rd person	4	1	5	80%	
	2. Lack of -ed for past tense	2	1	3	67%	Mod.
	3. Lack of -S for poss.	1	8	1	100%	
Bari	1. Lack of -S for 3rd person	4	0	4	100%	
	2. Hypercorrection (collective noun and verb agre.)	1	0	1	100%	
	3. Lack of -S for plural	5	2	7	71%	High
	4. Lack of -S for poss.	2	0	2	100%	
	5. Use of double negative	1	1	2	50%	
	6. Lack of -ed past tense	1	0	1	50%	
	7. Other: 1 ex. of phonological					

Table 2

Bari's Incubation/Conceptualization

Times Spent

Discourse	Non-talk/write	Talk/write
Poetic	8 mins.	16 mins.
Transactional	10 mins.	13 mins.
Expressive	5 mins.	9 mins.

Table 3

Average Number of Pauses Per 100 Words

During Three Modes of Discourse for Bari

Mode of Discourse	Av. # of Pauses Per 100 Words
I. Transactional	75
II. Expressive	60
III. Poetic	54.3

Table 4
Bari's Complete Writing Times

Discourse	Non-talk/write	Talk/write
Poetic	1 hr. 10 mins.	1 hr. 20 mins.
Transactional	50 mins.	58 mins.
Expressive	40 mins.	49 mins.

Table 5

The Nature and Extent of
Bari's Revisions

Process: Talk/Write

Discourse	Type of Revision	No. of Revisions
I-A. Transactional	Grammatical	1
	Word Changes	2
II-A. Expressive	Word Changes	4
	Grammatical	1
	Mechanical	1
III-A. Poetic	Word Changes	4
	Grammatical	2
	Total Changes	15

Process: Non-talk/write

Discourse	Type of Revision	No. of Revisions
I-B. Transactional	Grammatical	4
	Word Changes	3
	Mechanical	2
II-B. Expressive	Word Changes	2
	Mechanical	1
	Grammatical	1
III-B. Poetic	Grammatical	4
	Mechanical	3
	Total Changes	20

Table 6

Bari's Composing Behaviors
For Transactional, Expressive, and Poetic Writing
(Talk/Write and Non-Talk/Write Processes)

	Transactional		Expressive		Poetic	
	A. Talk/Write	B. Non-Talk/Write	A. Talk/Write	B. Non-Talk/Write	A. Talk/Write	B. Non-Talk/Write
Incubation/ Conceptualization	•Thought about subject for	•Thought about how to put down thoughts	•Thought of title	•Started immediately •Thought of how to put down thoughts correctly	•Mental outline: Thought about structure for composition	•Thought about what and how to put down thoughts
Production	•Frequent pauses •No written outline •Made translations from dialect to standard •Revised as she wrote •Linear writing pattern	•Frequent pauses •No written outline •Revised as she wrote •Linear writing pattern	•Frequent pauses •No outline •Revised as she wrote •Made translations •Linear writing pattern	•pauses •No outline •Revised as she wrote •Linear writing pattern	•Frequent pauses •No outline •Revised as she wrote •Frequent translations •Linear writing pattern	•Frequent pauses •No outline •Revised as she wrote •Many translations •Linear writing patterns
Revision	•Grammatical and word changes	•Grammatical, word changes, and spelling	•Word changes, grammatical & spelling	•Word changes, spelling and syntactical	•World changes & grammatical	•Grammatical, mechanical & spelling
	(Revised as she wrote)		(Revised as she wrote)		(Revised as she wrote)	

Table 7

Average Number of Words Produced Per Composition for Three Students in Two Types of Processes

Student	Talk/Write Av. Words Produced	Non-Talk/Write Av. Words Produced
Bari	189	219
Pam	182	274
Macy	218	394

Table 8
Comparison of

Intellectual Processes Employed by Three Students

in Three Modes of Discourse and Two Types of Processes

		Macy (low)	Pam (moderate)	Bari (high)
		No.	No.	No.
Assignments (Transactional)				
I-A, I-B Contrast	A	4	0	9
	B	3	5	0
	C	1	0	0
Total		8	5	9
Classification	MET.	3	2	0
	SYN.	1	1	2
	LEX.	0	0	1
Total		4	3	3
Focus				
Total		55	35	39

Table 8
(cont'd.)

		Macy (low)	Pam (moderate)	Bari (high)
		No.	No.	No.
Assignments (Expression)				
II-A, II-B Classification	MET.	0	0	0
	SYN.	17	5	6
	LEX.	0	1	1
Total		17	6	7
Focus				
Total		42	34	27
Assignments (Poetic)				
III-A, III-B Phy. Con.	GEO.	10	2	1
	OBJ.	8	2	5
Total		18	4	6
Change	INT.	2	0	0
	EXT.	2	2	4
	INT./EXT.	2	4	2
Total		6	6	6
Sequence	T	13	4	8
	L	2	1	1
Total		15	5	9
Focus				
Total		114	52	52

Table 8
(cont'd.)

LEGEND

CONTRAST

A: Between what appears to be and what actually is

B: Between two things which exist

C: Between what exists and what should exist

CHANGE

INT.: internal

EXT.: external

SEQUENCE

T.: time

L.: logical

CLASSIFICATION

MET.: metaphor

SYN.: syntactical

LEX.: lexical

PHYSICAL CONTEXT

GEO.: geographical

OBJ.: object(s) in a physical setting